Craig Zimmerman, Esq. (#167545) Gloria Ha, Esq. (#148708) Law Offices of Craig Zimmerman 1221 E. Dyer Road, Suite 120 Santa Ana, CA 92705 Tel: 714-933-4506 Fax: 714-545-2311 Email: gha@craigzlaw.com Attorneys for Plaintiff RYAN GERLACH 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 8 CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA 9 10 **SACV12-01058 JST (Ex)** CASE NO. RYAN GERLACH, 11 COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES Plaintiff, 12 13 SRA ASSOCIATES, INC., CIGPF I CORP. 14 **AMERICAN CORADIUS** INTERNATIONAL, LLC, SYSTEMS AND 15 SERVICES TECHNOLOGIES, INC., NCO. INC., EXPERT GLOBAL SOLUTIONS. 16 INC., AND DOES 1 TO 10. 17 Defendants. 18 19 INTRODUCTION 20 1. This is an action for actual and statutory damages brought by Plaintiff, RYAN 21 GERLACH, an individual consumer, against Defendants SRA ASSOCIATES, INC. (hereinafter 22 "SRA"), a debt collection agency, CIGPF I CORP (hereinafter "CIGPF"), a consumer creditor, 23 AMERICAN CORADIUS INTERNATIONAL, LLC (hereinafter "ACI"), a debt collection 24 agency, SYSTEMS AND SERVICES TECHNOLOGIES, INC. ("hereinafter "SST"), a debt 25 collection agency, NCO, INC. (hereinafter "NCO"), a debt collection company, and EXPERT 26

Complaint for Damages

GLOBAL SOLUTIONS, INC. (hereinafter "EGS"), a corporation, for breach of contract, fraud,

and violations of the California Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, California Civil

27

14

15

13

17

1.8 19

20 21

22

23

26 23

25

28

Code §1788 et. seq. (hereinafter "RFDCPA") and the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. (hereinafter "FDCPA"), which prohibits debt collectors from engaging in abusive, deceptive and unfair debt collection practices.

- 2. Mr. Gerlach makes these allegations on information and belief, with the exception of those allegations that pertain to himself which he alleges on personal knowledge.
- 3. Unless otherwise stated, plaintiff alleges that any violations by Defendants were knowing and intentional and that Defendants did not maintain procedures reasonably adapted to avoid any such violation.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 4. Subject-matter jurisdiction of this Court arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, 15 U.S.C. §1692(k) and 28 U.S.C. §1367 for supplemental state claims.
- 5. A court of this state may exercise jurisdiction on any basis not inconsistent with the Constitution of this state or of the United States. Cal. Civ. Proc. Code Ann. § 410.10 (West). Personal jurisdiction is established for the following Defendants because their activity within the state of California constitutes sufficient "minimum contacts." World-Wide Volkswagen Corp. v. Woodson, 444 U.S. 286, 291 (1980). These Defendants have an agent for service of process in California and are incorporated in California for the purpose of carrying on their debt collection businesses. Therefore, since the Defendants availed themselves of the privileges of the State of California, it is "foresceable" that they would have to defend a lawsuit there. Id. at 297.
- 6. ACI's agent for service of process is the CSC-Lawyers' Incorporating Service located at 2710 Gateway Oaks Dr. Suite 150N, Sacramento, CA 95833. SRA's agent for service of process is the CSC- Lawyers' Incorporating Service located at 2710 Gateway Oaks Dr. Suite 150N, Sacramento, CA 95833. NCO's and SST's agent for service of process is CT Corporation System located at 818 W Seventh St. Los Angeles, CA 90017. NCO and/or SST maintain several facilities in California.
- 7. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §1391. Venue is proper where a substantial part of the events giving rise to the claim occurred or where any Defendant reside. Since the Defendants are not natural persons, venue is proper where they are subject to personal jurisdiction, which is

5

7

6

8 Ġ

10 11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18 19

20 21

22 23

24

26

25

27 28 established in Paragraph 6 as being California. Further, venue is established because a substantial part of the events giving rise to the Plaintiff's claim occurred in California, the negotiation of the settlement agreement contract.

THE PARTIES

- 8. Plaintiff, Mr. Gerlach, is a natural person residing in Jefferson County, in the State of Illinois.
- 9. Defendant, SRA Associates, Inc., is incorporated in California and New Jersey. SRA does business nationally as a debt collection agency.
- 10. Defendant, CIGPF I Corp., is incorporated as a domestic corporation in the State of New York and as a foreign corporation in Illinois. CIGPF does business nationally as a creditor.
- 11. Defendant, ACI, is a registered LLC in California, and does business as a debt collection agency.
- 12. Defendant, Expert Global Solutions, Inc. EGS is incorporated in several states and does business internationally, providing a multitude of services.
- 13. Defendant, NCO, is incorporated in California and does business as a debt collection agency nationally. NCO is owned by Defendant, EGS.
- 14. Defendant, SST, is incorporated in several states and does business nationally as a debt collection agency. SST is owned by NCO.
- 15. Mr. Gerlach is allegedly obligated to pay a debt and is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3).
- 16. Defendants are persons who use an instrumentality of interstate commerce or the mails in a business the principal purpose of which is the collection of debts, or who regularly collects or attempts to collect, directly or indirectly debts owed or due or asserted to be owed or due another and are therefore "debt collectors" as that phrase is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(6).
- 17. Mr. Gerlach is a natural person from whom a debt collector sought to collect a consumer debt which was due and owing or alleged to be due and owing from Mr. Gerlach, and is a "debtor" as that term is defined by California Civil Code §1788.2(h).
 - 18. Defendants SRA, NCO, ACI, SST, and EGS, in the ordinary course of business,

27. One or more of the Defendants represented that as the assigned debt collector for Mr.

Gerlach's consumer debt ending in *842, one or more of the Defendants had the ability to bind

transferred to ACI and/or NCO for collection. CIGPF became the new creditor for the debt.

26

27

13 14

15 16

17 18

19 20

21

22 23

24 25

26 27

28

its client CIGPF in any settlement agreement contract entered into with Mr. Gerlach.

- 28. In its capacity as CIGPF's agent, Defendant SRA prepared a written settlement contract resolving in full the "consumer debt" ending in *842 allegedly owed by Mr. Gerlach to CIGPF, originally owed to Providian. (See Exhibit "A" to the Complaint)
- 29. The terms of the settlement agreement required \$2,300 as a settlement in full to be made in five payments; \$1,178 on or before May 31, 2011; \$280.50 on or before June 27, 2011; \$280.50 on or before July 27, 2011; \$280.50 on or before August 26, 2011; and \$280.50 on or before September 27, 2011.
 - 30. Defendant SRA and/or any other Defendants were to process the payment.
- 31. In consideration for this payment, Mr. Gerlach would receive from Defendants a discharge in full of his alleged consumer debt ending in *842 along with appropriate notification to the credit reporting agencies thereafter, as required by law.
- 32. Defendant SRA and/or any other Defendants arranged for the payment to be processed using check #6003, dated July 27, 2011.
 - 33. Mr. Gerlach timely made his July 27, 2011 payment.
- 34. Subsequently, on or around August 11, 2011, Mr. Gerlach learned for the first time that SRA and/or any other Defendants failed to process the payment.
- 35. On an unknown date, ACI contacted Mr. Gerlach in an attempt to collect on the debt again.
- 36. Through this conduct, which includes, but is not limited to breach of the settlement agreement, fraud, the false, misleading, deceptive, unfair or unconscionable practice of initiating and entering into a settlement agreement then placing the account with a different third party debt collector for further collection, the natural consequences of which was to harass, oppress and abuse Mr. Gerlach in connection with the collection of an already settled debt, Defendants SRA, NCO, and EGS violated RFDCPA §1788.13(e) and RFDCPA §1788.14(b).

2

3

4

6 7

8

10 11

12 13

14

16

17 18

19 20

21

22

23 24

25 26

27 28 **COUNT I**

BREACH OF CONTRACT

- 37. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.
- 38. The consideration set forth in the May 26, 2011 settlement agreement contract was fair and reasonable.
- 39. Mr. Gerlach performed all conditions, covenants, and promises required to be performed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the May 26, 2011 settlement agreement contract.
- 40. On or about July 27, 2011 one or more Defendants breached said agreement by refusing to accept Mr. Gerlach's payment pursuant to the terms of the settlement agreement contract.
- 41. By reason of Defendants breach of said settlement agreement contract as herein alleged, Mr. Gerlach, already suffered actual damages in the sum of \$1,739.00, the amount he paid pursuant to the settlement agreement that Defendant(s) breached.
- 42. Plaintiff prays to recover attorney fees incurred in the enforcement of the provisions of the settlement agreement contract and enforcement of the settlement agreement contract.

COUNT II

ACTUAL FRAUD

- 43. Plaintiff repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.
- 44. One or more Defendants made representations that the settlement agreement contract would end the dispute. Defendant(s) knew that these representations were false, as is evidenced by their further conduct to sell the purported debt of Mr. Gerlach to one or more other Defendants.
- 45. On or about May 26, 2011, with full knowledge and intent to induce Mr. Gerlach to pay, Defendants presented Mr. Gerlach with the settlement agreement contract regarding his alleged consumer credit account ending in *842 with Providian, later allegedly acquired by CIGPF. Defendants made a promise without any intention of performing it.
- 46. Mr. Gerlach relying on the representations made by one or more Defendants, entered into the settlement contract and made the initial payment of \$1,178, and subsequent payments of \$280.50.

- 47. The reliance on the part of Mr. Gerlach is justifiable because a reasonable person in his position would want to settle the case rather than go to litigation against powerful credit card companies. Notwithstanding how the purported debt came to exist or how the situation came to the settlement negotiations, Mr. Gerlach was reasonable in believing that the Defendants would be true to their words and representations.
- 48. SRA and/or one or more other Defendants led Mr. Gerlach to believe that the account ending in *842 was resolved and SRA and/or one or more other Defendants intentionally hid the fact that it did not process the payments made by Mr. Gerlach; never giving him notice that the account was recalled or had otherwise been transferred to CIGPF.
- 49. Once Mr. Gerlach's account ending in *842 was transferred to one of the Defendants, another consumer debt collector, the new debt collector refused to honor the original settlement agreement. Mr. Gerlach suffered damages because the new debt collector, one of the Defendants, instead demanded renegotiations based on a new, higher balance, due to the accrual of interest.
- 50. As a result, Mr. Gerlach prays for actual and punitive damages for Defendants' fraud as well as any other such relief as the court deems appropriate.

COUNT III

FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (FDCPA) 15 U.S.C. §§ 1692 ET SEQ.

- 51. Mr. Gerlach repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.
- 52. The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of the FDCPA, 15 U.S.C. §1692 et seq.
- 53. One or more Defendants used false or deceptive practices to collect the debt purported to be owed by Mr. Gerlach. 15 U.S.C. §1692e(10).
- 54. As a result of each and every violation of the FDCPA, Mr. Gerlach is entitled to any actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(1); statutory damages in an amount up to \$1,000 pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A); and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(3) from Defendants.

COUNT IV

2

ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT (RFDCPA) CAL. CIV. CODE §§1788-1788.32

3

55. Mr. Gerlach repeats, re-alleges, and incorporates by reference, all other paragraphs.

5

56. The foregoing acts and omissions constitute numerous and multiple violations of the RFDCPA, including but not limited to each and every one of the above cited provisions of the

6

RFDCPA, California Civil Code §§1788-1788.32.

8

57. One or more Defendants used false or deceptive practices to collect the debt purported to be owed by Mr. Gerlach. California Civil Code §1788.17.

9

58. As a result of each and every violation of the RFDCPA, Mr. Gerlach is entitled to any actual damages pursuant to California Civil Code §1788.30(a); statutory damages for a knowing

11

or willful violation in the amount up to \$1,000 pursuant to California Civil Code \$1788.30(b);

13 14 and reasonable attorney's fees and costs pursuant to California Civil Code §1788.30(c) from the Defendants.

15

16

59. As a result of the above violations of the Rosenthal Act, the Defendant is liable to Mr. Gerlach in the sum of Mr. Gerlach's actual damages, statutory damages in an amount up to \$1,000 and reasonable attorney's fees and costs from the Defendants.

17 18

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

19

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests that Judgment be entered against the Defendant:

20

1. For a monetary award in the amounts of:

21

(a) Plaintiff's actual damages;

22 23

(b) \$1,000.00 statutory damages, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k;

24

(c) \$1,000.00 statutory damages, pursuant to C.C. \$1788.30(b);

25 26 (d) \$1,000.00 statutory damages, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1681n(a)(1)(A)

27

(e) Punitive Damages for fraud and for a knowing or willful violation in the amount of not less than \$100 and up to \$5,000 for each violation as the court deems proper pursuant to California Civil Code \$1785.31(a)(2)(B) and 15 U.S.C. \$1681n(a)(1)(B)(2);

	[H. H. B. H.
1	(f) Restitution pursuant to Cal. Bus, & Prof. Code §17200;
2	(g) Costs and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k, C.C. §1788.30(c)
3	and 15 U.S.C. §1681n(a)(1)(B)(3);
	書記 회문으로 경우 리회생과 소프로그램(교육화) 그리고 그 그리고 있는 것이다. 그 라는 그리는 소유 경기인 내려 가는 그는 그 없다.
4	2. For such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.
5	Respectfully Submitted
6	Dated:
7	By Craig Zimmerman, Esq. (#167545)
8	Craig Zymmerman, Esq. (#167545) Gloria Ma, Esq. (#148708) Law Offices of Craig Zimmerman Attorneys for Plaintiff RYAN GERLACH
9	Attorneys for Plaintiff
10	
11	
12	는 사람들이 물로 전략하면 되는 사람들이 들었다. 그 사람들이 모르고 하는 것으로 되었다. 물건을 받는 것이 되었다. 그는 일이 말을 하는 것으로 되는 것이 되었다. 그 사람들이 되었다. 그 것으로 되었다.
13	[선물실 : 10 - 10 - 10] 전공업 2호로 보고 발표하는 말로 보고 하고 있는 것이다. 그는 이 그는 이 그리고 하는 것이다. 그는 것이다. 그는 것이다. [생물일 : 10 - 10 - 10] 전공업 2호로 보고 보고 하는 것이다. 그는 것이다. 그는 것이 되는 것이 되는 것이다. 그런 것이다. 그런 것이다.
14	마음보다는 사용에 가장하면 함께 가장하는 가장 하는 것이 되었다.
15	[40] 현실인, 그는 사용에 실기 회원에 유럽하셨습니다. 그 보고 있었습니다. 한 경험에서 하여 살인 것으로 보고 있어요? 그는 그는 그는 그를 보고 있었다. [1] 경상하는 하는 사용 경상 중에 보았다. 그는 사용하는 방송 그는 하는 사용이 되고 있는 사용으로 보고 있었습니다.
16	보고는 하는 것이 말을 통해 보고 있다면 보고 있다. [18] 15] 15] 15] 15] 15] 15] 15] 15] 15] 15
17	(1985년 - 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1987년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 1985년 - 1985년
18	[통] (1985년 - 1985년 1985년 - 1985년 1987년 1987년 - 1985년 1987년 1987년 1987년 1987년 1987년 1987년 1987년 1987년 1987년 198 - 1987년 - 1987년 1987
19	없는 경기를 가고 있는 것 같은 사람들은 사람들은 사람들이 되었다. 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그 그
20	사용을 하면 하는 경기를 잃었다. 그는 사용을 하는 사용이 되었다. 그는 사용을 하는 것이 되었다. 그는 사용을 하는 것이 되었다. 그는 것이 되었다. 그는 것이 되었다. 사용하는 사용을 하는 것이 되었다. 사용을 통해 보고 있는 것이 되었다. 그는 것이 되었다. 그는 것이 되었다. 그는 것이 되었다. 그는 것이 되었다.
21	
22	[통령기에 기타시 중인하다는 이 기계의 보고 되었습니다. 이 기가 되는 사람이 되었다. 그 기가 가능했다. [1] [1] 기가 그 그리고, 그는 기가 있는 것이 되었습니다. 그리고, 그리고, 그리고, 그리고, 그리고, 그리고, 그리고, 그리고,
23	합니다. 하는 사람들은 사람이 되었다. 그는 하는 사람들이 하는 사람들이 되었다. 그 사람들이 그
24	불러는 전후 명 경험적으로 한 경험을 받아 하는 데 리스 이 등을 보고 있는데 이 전에 되었다. 불편물이 한 경험적으로 한 경험을 받는데 하는데 되었다.
25	한 성도하는 보고 있는 이렇게 보고 있다. 그렇게 되는 사람들은 사람들이 되는 것이 되었다. 그렇게 되었다는 사람들은 사람들이 되었다. 그렇게 되었다는 것이 없는데 보고 있다면 보다 되었다. 그렇게 되었다면 보다 되었다면 되었다면 되었다면 보다 되었다면 되었다면 되었다면 되었다면 되었다면 되었다면 되었다면 되었다
26	[Mewine] 그 그는 그는 그는 그를 잃었다면서 하면서 물리가 보는 생생들이 그를 하는데 가능하는 것이다. 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그는 그를 보는데 되었다. 2시 - 그는 그 사람들이 가능했다. 그를 보는 것을 잃었습니다. 그들은 그를 보고 있는데 그를 보고 있다. 그는 그는 그를 보고 있는데 그를 보고 있다.
27	[HTT] 이 시간 1년 1월 1일
28	병용 등 등 보는 경기 보고 있다. 이 보고 있었다는 기를 보는 이 이 기를 통해 있다. 그들은 보고 있는 이 기를 통해 있다. 등 이 기를 보고 있는 것이 되었는 말라고 있는 것이 되는 것이 되는 것이 되는 것이 되는 것이 되는 것이 되었다.
۵۵	보면도 그러지 않는 선생활을 500분들로 하는 사람들은 사람들은 사람들이 모임하는 것이 되었다. 1985년 - 1985년 전 100분을 대한 1일
	-9- Complaint for Damages
	Complaint for Damages

Case 8:12-cv-01058-JLS-E Document 1 Filed 06/28/12 Page 9 of 13 Page ID #:9

Case 8:12-cv-01058-JLS-E Document 1 Filed 06/28/12 Page 10 of 13 Page ID #:10
UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
CIVIL COVER SHEET

Ryan Gerlach	SRA Associates, Inc., CIG Systems and Services Tec Inc., And Does I to 10,	iPF I Co Imologie	p, American Corad s, Inc., NCO, Inc., F	ius International Expert Global So	, LLC, lutions,		
(b) Attorneys (Firm Na yourself, provide sa	me, Address and Telephone Number. If me.)	f you are representing	Attorneys (If Known)	***************************************	<u>aire in team innier maini minumente m</u>		90cassoccossolio3rgespcoaccorn40*44
Ha, Esq. (#148708	ig Zimmerman, Craig Zimmerman, Eso , Suite 120, Santa Ana, CA 92705; Tel:						
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an X in one box only.)		NSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PAR X in one box for plaintiff and c			Only	**************************************
□ I U.S. Government Ple	intiff 23 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Part		ro	e der	Incorporated or P		PTF DI
☐2 U.S. Government De	fendant	izenship Citizen of An	other State 1912	W2	Incorporated and of Business in Ar		□5 □
	e in legación de la cidade de la companión de la cidade de Se cidade de la cida	Citizen or Sul	oject of a Foreign Country [] 3	D3	Foreign Nation		D6 D
IV. ORIGIN (Place an	X in one box only.)	ettemoduseine in Escrivinia en assistantia in muu					Manuel Mississier comme
	Removed from I 3 Remanded from Appellate Court	CI 4 Reinstated or C Reopened	J 5 Transferred from another di	strict (sp	ecify): □6 Multi Distr Litig	ict Judg	eal to Distr e from istrate Judg
V. REQUESTED IN C	경기 경화되었습니다.	강하지 이 가는 이 등을 하다 된다.	es' only if demanded in compla	544		anastrajakishte katalahtet takan termanan kalandaran da	
CLASS ACTION under	F.R.C.P. 23: Tyes No	C	I MONEY DEMANDED IN C	OMPL.	UNT: S		***************************************
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIC	N (Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under wi	nich you are filing and v	vrite a brief statement of cause.	Do not o	ite jurisdictional str	ututes unless div	ersity.)
•	Actual Fraud, Breach of Contract; Def	endant engaged in unfai	r debt collection practices in vio	olation o	15 USC 1692 and	numerous state	and commi
VII. NATURE OF SUI	(Place an X in one box only.)			anginaniminan		law cause	es of actio
OTHER STATUTE	CONTRACT	torts	TORTS		PRISONER	LAB	OR .
☐ 400 State Reapportion		PBRSONAL INJU	RY PERSONAL			□710 Fair La	bor Standa
□410 Antitrust	☐ 120 Marine	CI 310 Airplane	PROPERTY	□ 510	Motions to	Act	· #
☐ 430 Banks and Bankin☐ 450 Commerce/ICC		☐ 315 Airplane Proc Liability	luct □ 370 Other Fraud □ 371 Truth in Lendin		Vacate Sentence	□ 720 Lnbor// Relatio	
Rates/etc.	☐ 140 Negotiable Instrument ☐ 150 Recovery of	☐ 320 Assault, Libe	380 Other Personal		Habeas Corpus General	☐ 730 Labor/	
□ 460 Deportation	Overpayment &	Slander	Ima and deliners and assessment		Death Penalty	Reporti	
☐ 470 Racketeer Influen		☐ 330 Fed. Employe	as' □ 385 Property Damag		Mandamus/		ure Act
and Corrupt	Judgment	Liability	Product Linbility		Other	C 740 Railwa	
Organizations	□ 151 Medicare Act	☐ 340 Marine	BANKRIPTOV	550	Civil Rights	1 790 Other L	abor
19 480 Consumer Credit	☐ 152 Recovery of Defaulted	☐ 345 Marine Produ Liability	ct 1 422 Appeal 28 USC		Prison Condition	Litigati	
☐ 490 Cable/Sat TV	Student Loan (Excl.	☐ 350 Motor Vehicl	158			[C] 791 Empl. I	
□ 810 Selective Service	Veterans)	☐ 355 Motor Vehicl	e L1423 Wilnurawai 28		PENALTY	Securit	y Act
	dities/ 🗆 153 Recovery of	Product Liabi	m. 1 USC 157		Agriculture	PROPERT	
Exchange	Overpayment of	CJ 360 Other Person	al civil rugions	∥ LJ 62 0	Other Food &	C 820 Copyri	ghts
☐ 875 Customer Challen	ge 12 Veteran's Benefits G 160 Stockholders' Suits	Injury	☐ 441 Voting □ 442 Employment	m 426	Drug Drug Related	CI 830 Patent CI 840 Traden	rarb
USC 3410 CJ 890 Other Statutory A		☐ 362 Personal Inju		C.1 023	Seizure of	SOCIALS	
☐ 891 Agricultural Act	□ 195 Contract Product	Med Malprac ☐ 365 Personal Inju				1 861 HIA (1	
□ 892 Economic Stabiliz		☐ 365 Personal Inju Product Liabi	Section 1 and 1 an		881	□ 862 Black I	
Act	□ 196 Pranchise	☐ 368 Asbestos Per	99 (₩A inches la participa de la companya de la co		Liquor Laws	CI 863 DIWC	
☐ 893 Environmental M			t Disabilities -		R.R. & Truck	(405(g))
□ 894 Energy Allocation		Liability	Employment		Airline Regs	☐ 864 SSID T	
□ 895 Freedom of Info.		IMMIGRATION		□ 660	Occupational	□ 865 RSI (4	
□ 900 Appeal of Fee De			and the second of the second o		Safety /Health	FEDERAL	
nation Under Equ		Application	Other	LI 690	Other	□ 870 Taxes	3
Access to Justice	☐ 245 Tort Product Liability	A STATE OF THE STA	From Case Cartesian Section			0r Det	endant) Just Docto 2
1350 Constitutionality	of [290 All Other Real Property	1 465 Other Immigi	1 11(111)			USC.7	
State Statutes		Actions			til stræligtiger	1 00C/	
			40.00				
					ander the transmission of the state of the s		enenenii eegantuu tuttaan
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1、人名英格兰 化二氯甲基 医皮肤 化硫甲基甲基磺基甲基	ALCOHOLOGICA MARKANIN AND ALGARIA TO MATERIAL TO A TOTAL CONTRACTOR AND A STATE OF THE ACCURATE OF THE ACCURAT				

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY: Case Number: SACV12-01058 JST (Ex)

AFTER COMPLETING THE FRONT SIDE OF FORM CV-71, COMPLETE THE INFORMATION REQUESTED BELOW.

Case 8:12-cv-01058-JLS-E Document 1 Filed 06/28/12 Page 11 of 13 Page ID #:11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT, CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA CIVIL COVER SHEET

VIII(a). IDENTICAL CASES: Has If yes, list case number(s):	this action been pre	viously filed in this court an	d dismissed, remanded or closed? WNo □ Yes		
VIII(b). RELATED CASES: Have If yes, list case number(s):	uny cases been pre	viously filed in this court tha	t are related to the present case? MNo □ Yes		
CC. F	arise from the same call for determination or other reasons we	or closely related transaction of the same or substantial build entail substantial duplic	ns, happenings, or events; or ly related or similar questions of law and fact; or ation of labor if heard by different judges; or and one of the factors, identified above in a, b or c also is present.		
IX. VENUE: (When completing the (a) List the County in this District; C	alifornia County o	utside of this District: State i	f necessary.) If other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named plaintiff resides. this box is checked, go to item (b).		
County in this District.*	agencies of emplo	yecs is a named planton. A	California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
			Mount Vernon, IL		
(b) List the County in this District; CD Check here if the government, its	California County o	utside of this District; State (I if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH named defendant resides. If this box is checked, go to item (c).		
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Foreign Country		
Los Angeles Sacramento	<u>an an a</u>				
(c) List the County in this District; (County in this District; County	California County o	utside of this District; State	I if other than California; or Foreign Country, in which EACH claim arose. yed.		
County in this District:*			California County outside of this District; State, if other than California; or Poreign Country		
Orange			Cart M. Oliena Countes		
* Los Angeles, Orange, San Bernar Note: in land condemnation cases, us	dino, Riverside, V e the location of the	entura, Santa Barbara, or stract of land involved			
X. SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY (ANDIN	Date June 22, 2012		
or other papers as required by lav but is used by the Clerk of the C	v. This form, appro- ourt for the purpose	yed by the Judicial Conferen- of statisties, venue and initia	ormation contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings of of the United States in September 1974, is required pursuant to Local Rule 3-1 is not filed ating the civil docket sheet. (For more detailed instructions, see separate instructions sheet.)		
Key to Statistical codes relating to So Nature of Suit Code	Abbreviation	Substantive Statement	of Cause of Action		
861	HIA	All claims for health insurance benefits (Medicare) under Title 18, Part A, of the Social Security Act, as amended. Also, include claims by hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, etc., for certification as providers of services under the program. (42 U.S.C., 1935FF(b))			
862	BL	All claims for "Black Lung" benefits under Title 4, Part B, of the Federal Coal Mine Health and Safety Act of 1969. (30 U.S.C. 923)			
863	DIWC	All claims filed by insured workers for disability insurance benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended; plus all claims filed for child's insurance benefits based on disability. (42 U.S.C. 405(g))			
863	DIWW	All claims filed for widows or widowers insurance benefits based on disability under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42.U.S.C. 405(g))			
864	SSID	All claims for supplemental security income payments based upon disability filed under Title 16 of the Social Security Act, as amended.			
865	RSI	All claims for retirement U.S.C. (g))	(old age) and survivors benefits under Title 2 of the Social Security Act, as amended. (42		

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF ASSIGNMENT TO UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE FOR DISCOVERY

This case has been assigned to District Judge Josephine Tucker and the assigned discovery Magistrate Judge is Charles Eick.

The case number on all documents filed with the Court should read as follows:

SACV12- 1058 JST (Ex)

Pursuant to General Order 05-07 of the United States District Court for the Central District of California, the Magistrate Judge has been designated to hear discovery related motions.

All discovery related motions should be noticed on the calendar of the Magistrate Judge	

NOTICE TO COUNSEL

A copy of this notice must be served with the summons and complaint on all defendants (if a removal action is filed, a copy of this notice must be served on all plaintiffs).

Subsequent documents must be filed at the following location:

\Box	Western Division					
	312 N. Spring St., Rm. G-8					
	Los Angeles, CA 90012					

[X] Southern Division 411 West Fourth St., Rm. 1-053 Santa Ana, CA 92701-4516 Eastern Division 3470 Twelfth St., Rm. 134 Riverside, CA 92501

Failure to file at the proper location will result in your documents being returned to you.

Case 8:12-cv-01058-JLS-E Document 1 File	ed 06/28/12 Page 13 of 13 Page ID #:13
Craig Zimmerman, Esq. (#167545) Gloria Ha, Esq. (#148708) Law Offices of Craig Zimmerman 1221 East Dyer Road, Suite 120 Santa Ana, CA 92705	
Tel: 714-933-4506; Fax: 714-545-2311	
UNITED STATES I CENTRAL DISTRIC	DISTRICT COURT T OF CALIFORNIA
Ryan Gerlach	CASE NUMBER
PLAINTIFF(S) V.	SACV12-01058 JST (Ex)
SRA Associates, Inc., CIGPF I Corp, American Coradius International, LLC, Systems and Services Technologies, Inc., NCO, Inc., Expert Global Solutions Inc., And Does 1 to 10, DEFENDANT(S).	SUMMONS
or motion must be served on the plaintiff's attorney, Gl. 1221 E. Dyer Road, Suite 120, Santa Ana, CA 92705 judgment by default will be entered against you for the syour answer or motion with the court.	oria Ha , whose address . If you fail to do selief demanded in the complaint. You also must file
	Clerk, U.S. District Court
Dated:	By: ROLLS ROYCE CHECK
	(Seal of the Court)
(Use 60 days if the defendant is the United States or a United State 60 days by Rule 12(a)(3)].	s agency, or is an officer or employee of the United States. Allow
CV-01A (12/07) SUM!	AONS ALCONOMIC CONTRACTOR AND ACTION OF A STATE OF A ST